

Remarks

The paragraphs of the Office action are responded to through the numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

1. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. § 102 "that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action." The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.
2. The Examiner rejected claim 1–4 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Young, III et al."

With regard to claim 1, the applicant has requested that claim 1 be amended to more clearly point out that the back end interface of applicant's invention includes a media access controller which uses carrier sense multiple access collision detection to control access to the power line. The applicant believes that neither the cited reference nor any other known reference describes or suggests the combination of elements recited in claim 1. Accordingly the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection with regard to claim 1.

With regard to claim 2, the applicant is unable to find any reference in the cited reference to various recited steps, including the "encrypting" step recited as element (B)

---

of claim 2. Since all of the elements of the claim as originally presented do not appear to be found in the cited reference, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection with regard to claim 2.

With regard to claim 3, the applicant is unable to find any reference in the cited reference to various recited steps, including the "decrypting" step recited as element (H) of claim 3. Since all of the elements of the claim as originally presented do not appear to be found in the cited reference, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection with regard to claim 3.

With regard to claim 4, the applicant has requested that claim 4 be amended to more clearly point out that the digital processor recited in this claim further comprises a variable gain amplifier controller, which further comprises a power detector connected to an integrator low pass filter, which in turn is connected to a gain controller. The applicant believes that neither the cited reference nor any other known reference either describes or suggests the combination of elements recited in this claim 4. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

#### Conclusion

3. The Examiner indicated that certain "prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure." The applicant appreciates the Examiner's search and respectfully requests that this "prior art" be included amount the


---

cited references in this case. The applicant believes that no further specific response is required for this paragraph.

4. The Examiner has provided information concerning communication and/or inquiries concerning this case. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate and assistance regarding this case and believes no response to this paragraph is necessary.

The applicant has requested that claims 1 and 4 be amended as previously described. The applicant has described why the applicant believes the originally recited elements of claims 2 and 3 are not anticipated by the cited reference. The applicant has also included an amendment to paragraph 0036 to correct a typographical error. The applicant does not intend by this correction to enter any new matter into the application. The applicant therefore believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office action have been addressed. Applicant believes that the pending claims 1-4 including the amended claims 1 and 4, are patentable over all known prior art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted this 14th day of June, 2005.

  
Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40,154  
SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.

Attorney Docket No. 4265.1 P

RESPONSE TO

Examiner: Donnie L. Crosland

App. S/N: 09/846,744

"NON-FINAL" OFFICE ACTION

Group Art Unit: 2636

Amdt Date: 06/14/2005

of 12/14/2004

Confirmation No. 4475

---

15 West South Temple, Suite 1200

Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Telephone: (801) 257-1900

Facsimile: (801) 257-1800